

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

APPEAL NO.:

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents

In re Patent Application of:

Group Art Unit: 2151

Robert P. Morris

Examiner: Saket K. Daftuar

Application No.: 10/813,715

Confirmation No.: 7428

Filed: March 31, 2004

For: System and Method for Providing
User Selectable Electronic Message Action
Choices and Processing

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

John A. Demos
Reg. No. 52,809
Attorney for Appellant
111 Corning Road, Ste 220
Cary, NC 27518

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....	3
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	4
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	5
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	6
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	7
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	9
VII. ARGUMENTS.....	10
A. Summary of the Applied Rejections	10
B. The Cited Prior Art.....	12
C. Claims 1-38 are not anticipated by Geiger under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	13
D. Summary of Arguments	18
APPENDIX A.....	20
APPENDIX B.....	28
APPENDIX C	29

Application No. 10/813,715
Paper filed: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed October 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. I226/US
Page 3 of 29

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Appellant respectfully submits that Scenera Technologies, LLC is the real party in interest, as evidenced by the assignment set forth at Reel 018489, Frame 0421.

Application No. 10/813,715
Paper filed: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed October 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. I226/US
Page 4 of 29

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant states that no such proceedings exist.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-38 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 18, 35 and 37 are presented in independent form. No claims have been allowed, and claims 1-38 stand rejected by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed on October 6, 2008. The rejection of claims 1-38 is appealed and all applied rejections concerning those claims are herein being appealed.

Application No. 10/813,715
Paper filed: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed October 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. I226/US
Page 6 of 29

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All Amendments have been entered. See the Final Office Action mailed October 6, 2008.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed subject matter is directed to a method, computer readable medium, and systems for providing user selectable electronic message action choices and processing. See Title. Specifically, claim 1 is directed to a method for providing user selectable electronic message action choices and processing. See Page 3, Lines 9-10; Page 5, Lines 3-5. The method includes the step of receiving an electronic message for a client. See Page 3, Line 10; Page 5, Line 5. The method further includes the step of determining if the electronic message matches at least one criteria of a filter, wherein at least one action is associated with the filter. See Page 3, Lines 10-12; Page 5, Lines 5-7. The method further includes the step of if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected. See Page 3, Lines 12-13; Page 5, Lines 9-11.

Further, claim 18 is directed to a computer readable medium with program instructions for providing user selectable electronic message action choices and processing. The program includes instructions for receiving an electronic message for a client See Page 3, Line 10; Page 5, Line 5. The program further includes instructions for determining if the electronic message matches at least one criteria of a filter, wherein at least one action is associated with the filter. See Page 3, Lines 10-12; Page 5, Lines 5-7. The program further includes instructions for if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected. See Page 3, Lines 12-13; Page 5, Lines 9-11.

Further, claim 35 is directed to a system. The system includes a storage medium for storing a plurality of filters, each filter comprising at least one criteria. See Page 7, Lines 8-10. The storage medium is also for storing a plurality of actions, each action capable of being associated with one of the plurality of filters. See Page 7, Lines 9-10. The system includes a mail server. See Page 5, Line 14. The mail server receives an

electronic message for a client, See Page 3, Line 10; Page 5, Line 5. The mail server determines if the electronic message matches the criteria of one of the plurality of filters, See Page 3, Lines 10-12; Page 5, Lines 5-7. The mail server, if the electronic message matches the criteria of the filter, displaying a graphic associated with the action associated with the matching filter when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected. See Page 3, Lines 12-13; Page 5, Lines 9-11.

Further, claim 37 is directed to a system. The system includes a storage medium for storing a plurality of filters, each filter comprising at least one criteria. See Page 7, Lines 8-10. The storage medium is also for storing a plurality of actions, each action capable of being associated with one of the plurality of filters. See Page 7, Lines 9-10. The system includes an electronic mail application that determines if an electronic message matches the criteria of one of the plurality of filters, See Page 3, Lines 10-12; Page 5, Lines 5-7. The electronic mail application that, if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action associated with the matching filter when the electronic message is viewed and executing the action if the graphic is selected. See Page 3, Lines 12-13; Page 5, Lines 9-11.

Application No. 10/813,715
Paper filed: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed October 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. I226/US
Page 9 of 29

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 USC 102, as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,142 to Geiger, et al. (hereinafter "Geiger").

VII. ARGUMENTS

A. Summary of the Applied Rejections

The Office rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,142 to Geiger, et al. (hereinafter "Geiger"). In so doing, the Office responded to Applicant's arguments by stating:

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant continues to argue in substance that: a. Geiger fails to disclose or even suggest "if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected" and argues that static buttons that are presented every time.

In response to applicant argument a), Geiger discloses Automated post office based rule analysis of e-mail messages and other data objects for controlled distribution in network environments where various software products provide for automatic deferral and review of e-mail messages and other data objects in a networked computer system, by applying business rules to the messages as they are processed by the post offices. Using the same analysis, provided by applicant representative, one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize "Gatekeeper" with different gatekeeper actions and roles. Such roles or action could be a "review" or "release" as shown in action gatekeeper Graphical User Interface. For example, Figure 19 is "Gatekeeper" GUI where gatekeeper has an access to take available action for Gated messages and therefore, all graphic or action buttons, 1907 . . . 1915, are displayed. These buttons are displayed because the electronic message follow the rule to display all graphic buttons and one having ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize this without any brief clarification. Similarly when gatekeeper wants to create a message and wants to review it before sending to appropriate sender, Note the "review" graphic button is not displayed, it follows the rule to display other graphic buttons except "review" and one having ordinary skill in the art must recognize this. Therefore, applicant argument that all buttons are static and they do not follow the electronic filter criteria is not correct as each gatekeeper tab or interface has its own criteria and each criteria has its own way of matching graphic action buttons as shown clearly in figures 19-20. Similarly, one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize the list of all graphic action displayed under certain tab or

interface as an action list represented by "graphic icons". In addition the same user interface is available for client for their use where the system is receiving message for their client and storing the messages for the recipients.

"In e-mail systems which use mail servers, post offices deliver incoming messages to a mail server which persistently stores the messages for the recipients. The recipients access the messages via the client applications. In some systems where mail servers are not used, the post offices deliver e-mail messages directly to the client applications. The e-mail client applications are end-user applications for creating, reading, and managing a user's individual e-mail account" (Background of Invention)

Therefore, applicant argument that Geiger fails to disclose electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected and applicant argument that all graphic buttons are static is not persuasive.

In rejecting the claims, the Office stated:

As per claim 1, Geiger discloses (a) receiving an electronic message [incoming messages] for a client [for the recipient] (see column 1, line 49-57);(b) determining if the electronic message matches at least one criteria of a filter [rules, business rules], wherein at least one action is associated with the filter (Abstract, column 3, lines 30-61; examiner considers "Each business rule describes a particular action to be applied to an e-mail message in response to either attributes of the e-mail message or performance data of the post office.

For example, a business rule may specify actions such as deleting the e-mail message, gating the e-mail message for further review, copying the e-mail message, returning the e-mail message to its sender without delivering it. . ." as electronic messages matches at least one filtering criteria and action associated with the filter); and (c) if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated ["graphic buttons"] with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic ["graphics can be a plurality of buttons displayed as part of the electronic message", specification page 7 such as action buttons at GUI] is selected (Figures 19-20s a screen shot of graphical user interface of action gatekeeper that shows graphic buttons and rules status [filtering status] for each message, see Figure 19-20, blocks 1907,1909,191 1,191 3,191 5 are graphic buttons associated with business rules , column 23, lines 5-36).

As per claims 18-34, claims 18-34 are computer readable medium claims of method claims 1-17, respectively. They do not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claims 1-17. Therefore, claims 18-24 are rejected under same scopes as discussed in claims 1-17, supra.

As per claims 35-36, claims 35-36 are system claims of method claims 1, and 7-8. Therefore, claim 35 - 36 also recites the limitation as discussed in claims 1 and 7-8, supra. In addition to method claims limitation 1 and 7-8, claims 35-36 further discloses a storage medium, mail server and plug-in server for storing filters and application programs [see column 1, line 25 - column 2 line 44].

As per claims 37-38, claims 37-38 are system claims of claims 1-17 and 35-36, respectively. They do not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claims 1-17 and 35-36. Therefore, claims 37-38 are rejected under same scopes as discussed in claims 1-17 and 35-36, supra.

B. The Cited Prior Art

Geiger is directed to “automated post office based rule analysis of e-mail messages and other data objects for controlled distribution in network environments.” See Title. For example, Geiger states:

A system, method and various software products provide for automatic deferral and review of e-mail messages and other data objects in a networked computer system, by applying business rules to the messages as they are processed by post offices. The system includes rule enforcing post offices that store a plurality of business rules derived from business communication policies. The rule enforcing post offices receive messages from client applications and from other post offices and apply the business rules with a rule engine. The rule engine determines a set of actions, specified by business rules that are fired, to be applied to each message. The rule engine provides the actions to a distribution engine, which executes a highest priority action. Actions include releasing, deleting, returning, forwarding, or gating the message. Gating forwards the message to a gatekeeper, an administrator assigned to review messages for conformity with business policies or for other reasons. The gated messages are received by the gatekeeper at a gatekeeping post office. A gatekeeper can review the gated messages, and then manually release, delete, return, or further gate the message. Alternatively, if the gatekeeper does not review a gated message with a specified time period, the

message is automatically reviewed by the gatekeeping post office with its own set of business rules. Having multiple post offices with independent sets of business rules allows for distributed and hierarchical review and gating of the messages. The system can route any type of data object, and apply the business rules to such objects in a similar manner. See Abstract

Geiger discloses a server that provides the gatekeeping functions described above. Specifically, Geiger states

The present invention enables the data server to monitor e-mail messages and other data objects, and to selectively gate, delete, forward, copy, release, or return e-mail messages and other data objects by applying the business rules to the messages and data received at the post office for delivery to others. Gating messages re-route the e-mail message from its specified recipients to a gatekeeper at a gatekeeping post office. Here, the gated message is additionally reviewed (either manually or automatically) and further processed, which again may include any of the above actions. See Col. 3 line 9-20

Geiger continues describing these functions by stating:

A GPO 106 is a post office that provides for administrative review and processing of gated messages. A GPO 106 provides for both manual review by a gatekeeper--a person designated to review gated messages--and automatic review and processing using its own set of business rules. Processing applies various actions to gated messages, including deleting the message without delivering it to the specified recipients, returning a message to its sender, copying a message prior to sending, editing a message, forwarding the message to a new recipient, and releasing a message for distribution to its specified recipients. A GPO 106 provides for both immediate execution of these processing actions or delayed execution. Thus, the primary function of the GPO 106 operates contrary to the conventional unabated delivery model by adding an additional processing and review layer between the sending of the message and its receipt (if ever) by the originally specified recipients. See Col. 7 line 31-47

C. Claims 1-38 are not anticipated by Geiger under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office has failed to show in a single prior art document, Geiger, the recited feature of "if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic

associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected" as recited in independent claims 1, 18, 35 and 37, and improperly relies on conclusory statements without support from Geiger to reject the claims.

To support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every feature of the claimed invention must be shown in a single prior art document. In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994); In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The pending claims positively recite limitations that are not disclosed (nor suggested) in the cited document. Specifically, claim 1 includes a recitation directed to "if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected." Geiger fails to disclose or even suggest such a recitation.

The Office cites Figure 19-20, blocks 1907,1909,1911,1913,1915 and the description found at column 23, lines 5-36 as disclosing the above referenced recitation. The cited sections of Geiger fail to disclose or suggest the above referenced recitation. The Office relies on the business rules disclosed in Geiger as anticipating the filter recitation of the instant claim. Specifically, the business rules in Geiger are directed to gating. Geiger teaches "gating" (C7:9-13, C7:44-47) where one of the automatic actions is to send the mail for review to an administrator who is **NOT** the recipient.

Notwithstanding the above referenced deficiency of Geiger, Applicant will address the above referenced recitation with regard to the administrator views. The administrator can access the "gated" mail via an administrator client illustrated in Figures 19 and 20 and described in Column 9 lines 42-43, Column 10 lines 54-55, and Column 23 lines 58-60. Figure 19 illustrates a GUI showing a message list and Figure 20 illustrates a GUI presented after selection of a message from the message list for review. The buttons illustrated in each of Figures 19 and 20 are static buttons that are presented every time the sample screen in Figures 19 and 20 are presented. There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Geiger that the display of the buttons in either Figure 19 or Figure 20 is in any way related to matching a filter. Use of the buttons is at

the discretion of the reviewer/administrator, and the buttons available are always present.

The graphic buttons in Geiger are displayed independent of the business rules disclosed in Geiger. For example, button 1907 is a review button. The review button merely allows a message to be reviewed in the screen illustrated in Figure 20. The review button itself is not presented based on the electronic message meets the criteria. Rather, this button is presented each time the sample screen illustrated in Figure 19 is shown. It is clear from the cited sections that the gatekeeper screen 1901 is displayed when the gatekeeper logs on. The gatekeeper screen 1901 displayed includes the buttons discussed above. As the buttons are displayed as part of gatekeeper screen 1901 at log on, the buttons cannot said to be displayed if the electronic message matches the criteria. In response to Applicant's arguments, the Office states "These buttons are displayed because the electronic message follow the rule to display all graphic buttons and one having ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize this without any brief clarification."

The Office offers no support for the conclusory statement that "these buttons are displayed because the electronic message follows the rule to display all graphic buttons." There is simply no support for this conclusory statement in Geiger at all. The buttons shown in Figure 19 are displayed irrespective of the messages included in Figure 19. There is no suggestion, much less any teaching or disclosure, whatsoever of the buttons illustrated in Figure 19 being based on any rule. Further, such a conclusory statement cannot form a basis for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The Office continues, stating, "Note the 'review' graphic button is not displayed, it follows the rule to display other graphic buttons except 'review' and one having ordinary skill in the art must recognize this." The importance of a determination of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art is pertinent for an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is unclear to Applicant as to how such a determination can be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. As stated above, to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every feature of the claimed invention must be shown

in a single prior art document. Any analysis of the knowledge of one having ordinary skill in the art has no place in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant respectfully requests the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Further, the Office again offers no support for the conclusory statement that “it follows the rule to display other graphic buttons except ‘review’.” There is simply no support for this conclusory statement in Geiger at all. Figure 19 illustrates the GUI showing a list of messages presented upon login. Figure 20 illustrates a GUI that is presented upon selection of a message for review. It logically follows that the review button would not be shown in the review GUI illustrated in Figure 20. The buttons shown in Figure 20 are displayed irrespective of the message illustrated in Figure 20. There is no teaching whatsoever of the buttons illustrated in Figure 20 being based on any rule. Further, as stated above, such a conclusory statement cannot form a basis for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Accordingly, since Geiger fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention for at least the above reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Geiger. Further, claims 18, 35 and 37 contain analogous recitations to those discussed above and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, rejected claims 2-17, 19-34, 36, and 38 are novel and inventive for at least the same reasons.

Further, as stated above, claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-12, and 14 are allowable for at least the same reasons stated above. Further, each of these claims contains additional recitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Geiger. Applicant presented arguments in the paper dated January 9, 2008 regarding the above referenced claims. The Office failed to address these arguments and simply repeated the text from the rejection made in the previous Office Action without noting Applicant’s traversal of the rejection. MPEP section 707.07(f) requires the Office to answer all material traversed. Specifically, the section states, “where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant’s argument and answer the substance of it.” Applicant respectfully requested the Office

specifically address the below presented arguments. For each of the below listed claims, Applicant stated in previous communications "If the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is requested to point out particularly where this feature is disclosed or suggested in the cited document." The Office has failed to address these arguments.

Specifically, claim 3 includes a recitation directed to "placing the electronic message with the action list in the recipient's inbox." The action cites Column 19, line 52 - column 21 line 24 of Geiger as anticipating this recitation. Applicant has reviewed Geiger and can find no reference in the cited section (or any other section for that matter) to "placing the electronic message with the action list in the recipient's inbox." As stated above, Geiger does not discuss a recipient inbox in any manner other than describing in the background, and e-mail client application by stating "e-mail client applications are end-user applications for creating, reading, and managing a user's individual e-mail account." This section cannot be said to anticipate "placing the electronic message with the action list in the recipient's inbox" as recited in claim 3.

Further, claims 4 and 5 include recitations directed to "inserting computer code into the electronic message if the electronic message matches the criteria" and to "inserting a graphic associated with each action in the action list into the electronic message" respectively. The action cites "Figure 19-20, blocks 1907, 1909, 1911, 1913, 1915 are graphic buttons, column 23, lines 5-36" and "column 1, line 35 - column 2, line 14" of Geiger as anticipating these recitations. Applicant can find no reference in the cited section (or any other section for that matter) to "inserting computer code into the electronic message" or "inserting a graphic associated with each action in the action list into the electronic message." There is simply no discussion in Geiger of inserting computer code into a message or a graphic into an action list.

Claims 7-9 and 14 each include recitations directed to actions taken at the client. The Action cites column 21, line 26 - column 22 line 10 and column 23, lines 5-36 as anticipating the recitations included in claims 7-9. Applicant can find no reference in the cited section (or any other section for that matter) to actions taken on the client. There is no reference to actions taken at the client that receives the message.

Claims 11-12 include recitations directed to "the criteria of the filter are customizable for a recipient" and "the action is customizable for a recipient." The Action cites "Figure 4B, for automatic and manual review with Figures 6-8 that shows different options to configure filters and rules" as anticipating the recitations described above. Applicant can find no reference in the cited Figures (or any other Figure or section for that matter) to criteria or actions customizable for a recipient. There is no reference to any recipient based customization. Figures 4B and 6-7 all describe actions and criteria that are based on the gatekeeper role and not the recipient. Figure 8 shows a GUI for creating rules based on message properties such as size and attachment size. There is simply no disclosure or suggestion of recipient based customization of criteria of the filter or of an action in Geiger.

As stated above, Applicant has presented arguments regarding the above referenced claims, that the Office has failed to address and simply repeated the text from previous rejections without noting Applicant's traversal of the rejection. MPEP section 707.07(f) requires the Office to answer all material traversed. Specifically, the section states, "where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it."

Accordingly, claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-12, and 14 are considered allowable over Geiger for at least this reason as well.

D. Summary of Arguments

For at least the reasons set forth above, Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1-38 are allowable over the cited reference. Appellant respectfully requests that the final rejection of claims 1-38 be reversed.

Note: For convenience of detachment without disturbing the integrity of the remainder of pages of this Appeal Brief, Appellant's APPENDICES A-C are attached on separate sheets following the signatory portion of this Appeal Brief.

Application No. 10/813,715
Paper filed: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed October 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. I226/US
Page 19 of 29

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, associated with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. **50-3512**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2009

By: /John A. Demos/
John A. Demos
Reg. No. 52,809

Customer No: **49278**
111 Corning Road; Ste. 220
Cary, North Carolina 27518
919 233 1942 x219 (voice)
919 233 9907 (fax)

APPENDIX A

CLAIMS

1. A method for providing user selectable electronic message action choices and processing, comprising the steps of:
 - receiving an electronic message for a client;
 - determining if the electronic message matches at least one criteria of a filter, wherein at least one action is associated with the filter; and
 - if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected.
2. The method of claim 1, wherein the determining step further comprises:
 - adding the action associated with the filter to an action list for the electronic message, if the electronic message matches the criteria.
3. The method of claim 2, wherein the adding step comprises:
 - receiving a plurality of filters configured for a recipient of the electronic message;
 - comparing the electronic message against criteria of each of the plurality of filters;
 - for each filter with criteria matching the electronic message, adding an action associated with the filter to an action list for the electronic message; and
 - placing the electronic message with the action list in the recipient's inbox.
4. The method of claim 2, wherein the displaying step comprises:
 - inserting computer code into the electronic message if the electronic message matches the criteria, wherein the computer code displays the graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executes the action if the graphic is selected.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein the inserting step comprises:
receiving from the client a request for the electronic message;
obtaining the electronic message from the recipient's inbox; and
inserting a graphic associated with each action in the action list into the electronic message.
6. The method of claim 2, wherein the displaying step comprises:
determining that the client is a supported client;
adding the action list to the electronic message; and
sending the electronic message to the client.
7. The method of claim 1, further comprising:
receiving a selection of the graphic;
checking for a plug-in associated with the action at the client; and
invoking the plug-in, if the plug-in is found.
8. The method of claim 7, further comprising:
requesting the plug-in from a plug-in server, if the plug-in is not found;
receiving the plug-in from the plug-in server;
installing the received plug-in; and
invoking the plug-in.
9. The method of claim 1, further comprising:
receiving a selection of the graphic;
sending an action request for the action associated with the selected graphic to a server; and
processing a response to the request from the server.

10. The method of claim 9, further comprising:
receiving the action request by the server;
invoking a plug-in associated with the action; and
sending a response to the action request to the client.
11. The method of claim 1, wherein the criteria of the filter are customizable for a recipient.
12. The method of claim 1, wherein the action is customizable for a recipient.
13. The method of claim 1, wherein the determining step (b) is performed at a mail server.
14. The method of claim 1, wherein the determining step (b) is performed at the client.
15. The method of claim 1, wherein the determining step (b) is performed at a relay server.
16. The method of claim 1, wherein the client comprises one or more of a group consisting of:
a cellular phone;
a personal computer;
a personal digital assistant; and
an image capture device.
17. The method of claim 1, wherein the electronic message comprises a file attachment, wherein the file attachment comprises an image file.

18. A computer readable medium with program instructions for providing user selectable electronic message action choices and processing, comprising the instructions for:

- receiving an electronic message for a client;
- determining if the electronic message matches at least one criteria of a filter, wherein at least one action is associated with the filter;
- if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected.

19. The medium of claim 18, wherein the determining instruction further comprises: adding the action associated with the filter to an action list for the electronic message, if the electronic message matches the criteria.

20. The medium of claim 19, wherein the adding instruction comprises:

- receiving a plurality of filters configured for a recipient of the electronic message;
- comparing the electronic message against criteria of each of the plurality of filters;
- for each filter with criteria matching the electronic message, adding an action associated with the filter to an action list for the electronic message; and
- placing the electronic message with the action list in the recipient's inbox.

21. The medium of claim 19, wherein the displaying step comprises:

- inserting computer code into the electronic message if the electronic message matches the criteria, wherein the computer code displays the graphic associated with the action when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executes the action if the graphic is selected.

22. The medium of claim 21, wherein the inserting instruction comprises:

receiving from the client a request for the electronic message;
obtaining the electronic message from the recipient's inbox; and
inserting a graphic associated with each action in the action list into the electronic message.

23. The medium of claim 19, wherein the displaying step comprises:
determining that the client is a supported client;
adding the action list to the electronic message; and
sending the electronic message to the client.
24. The medium of claim 18, further comprising:
receiving a selection of the graphic;
checking for a plug-in associated with the action at the client; and
invoking the plug-in, if the plug-in is found.
25. The medium of claim 24, further comprising:
requesting the plug-in from a plug-in server, if the plug-in is not found;
receiving the plug-in from the plug-in server;
installing the received plug-in; and
invoking the plug-in.
26. The medium of claim 18, further comprising:
receiving a selection of the graphic;
sending an action request for the action associated with the selected graphic to a server; and
processing a response to the request from the server.
27. The medium of claim 26, further comprising:
receiving the action request by the server;

invoking a plug-in associated with the action; and
sending a response to the action request to the client.

28. The medium of claim 18, wherein the criteria of the filter are customizable for a recipient.

29. The medium of claim 18, wherein the action is customizable for a recipient.

30. The medium of claim 18, wherein the determining instruction (b) is performed at a mail server.

31. The medium of claim 18, wherein the determining instruction (b) is performed at the client.

32. The medium of claim 18, wherein the determining instruction (b) is performed at a relay server.

33. The medium of claim 18, wherein the client comprises one or more of a group consisting of:

- a cellular phone;
- a personal computer;
- a personal digital assistant; and
- an image capture device.

34. The medium of claim 18, wherein the electronic message comprises a file attachment, wherein the file attachment comprises an image file.

35. A system, comprising:
a storage medium for storing:

a plurality of filters, each filter comprising at least one criteria, and
a plurality of actions, each action capable of being associated with one of the plurality of filters; and
a mail server, wherein the mail server:
receives an electronic message for a client,
determines if the electronic message matches the criteria of one of the plurality of filters, and
if the electronic message matches the criteria of the filter, displaying a graphic associated with the action associated with the matching filter when the electronic message is viewed at the client and executing the action if the graphic is selected.

36. The system of claim 35, further comprising:
a plug-in server; and
a plurality of plug-ins stored in the storage medium, wherein each plug-in is capable of being invoked when one of the plurality of actions is executed.

37. A system, comprising:
a storage medium for storing:
a plurality of filters, each filter comprising at least one criteria, and
a plurality of actions, each action capable of being associated with one of the plurality of filters; and
an electronic mail application, wherein the application:
determines if an electronic message matches the criteria of one of the plurality of filters, and
if the electronic message matches the criteria, displaying a graphic associated with the action associated with the matching filter when the electronic message is viewed and executing the action if the graphic is selected.

38. The system of claim 37, further comprising:

a plug-in server; and
a plurality of plug-ins stored in the storage medium, wherein each plug-in is capable of being invoked when one of the plurality of actions is executed.

Application No. 10/813,715
Paper filed: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed October 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. I226/US
Page 28 of 29

APPENDIX B

EVIDENCE

(NONE)

Application No. 10/813,715
Paper filed: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed October 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. I226/US
Page 29 of 29

APPENDIX C

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

(NONE)